

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA

MANETIRONY CLERVRAIN et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

MANUEL PADILLA, JR. et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 3:22-cv-05213-LK

ORDER OF DISMISSAL

This matter comes before the Court sua sponte. In April 2022, the Court notified Plaintiffs of various deficiencies with their initial case filings: they omitted the required civil cover sheet, they failed to sign their filings as required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11 and Local Civil Rule 83.2, one of them filed an incorrect application to proceed in forma pauperis (without paying the filing fee), and the rest did not submit such an application. Dkt. Nos. 2–6 at 1.¹ Plaintiffs were

¹ Plaintiff Manetirony Clervrain is the only one of the five Plaintiffs who provided an address to the Court, Dkt. No. 1-1 at 1–2, so the Court sent notices to the other Plaintiffs in care of that Plaintiff. Dkt. Nos. 3–6. Plaintiff Clervrain does not claim to be an attorney, and a non-attorney cannot represent other people, except in rare circumstances not present here. *See Johns v. Cnty of San Diego*, 114 F.3d 874, 876 (9th Cir. 1997). And “[a] business entity, except a sole proprietorship, must be represented by counsel.” LCR 83.2(b)(4). Therefore, the other four Plaintiffs, including “Brandako Inc.,” are not properly before the Court.

1 warned that the failure to fix those deficiencies could result in “dismissal of the action by the
2 Court.” *Id.* The latest deadline to fix those deficiencies was May 13, 2022, Dkt. No. 3 at 1, but
3 Plaintiffs have not responded to the Court’s notices or filed anything since their initial filings in
4 April 2022.

5 Based on the above deficiencies, the Court DISMISSES the case without prejudice. The
6 Clerk is directed to send uncertified copies of this Order to Plaintiffs at the address provided by
7 Plaintiff Manetirony Clervrain.

8 Dated this 5th day of January, 2023.

9 

10

Lauren King
11 United States District Judge
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24